



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,642	11/24/2003	Arash Rouhi	7389	4676
55740 7590 02/14/2008 GAUTHIER & CONNORS, LLP 225 FRANKLIN STREET SUITE 2300 BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER				
FEARER, MARK D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2143				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,642

Applicant(s)

ROUHI, ARASH

Examiner

MARK D. FEARER

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI-108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 17 February 2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 17 February 2004 has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figure 6 lacks descriptive labels. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application

must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-20 and 23-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gerszberg et al. (US 6480748 B1).

Consider claims 1, 33, 35, and 37-38. Gerszberg et al. clearly discloses a multimedia network system for inter-connecting a number of receiving and transmitting digital and/or analogous devices, the network system comprising: a number of receiving

and/or transmitting terminals to be connected to said digital and/or analogous devices (column 4 lines 27-47), application specific connector arrangements for connecting said digital and/or analogous devices to said terminals (column 12 lines 63-67 and column 13 lines 1-44), a controller, and at least one of said connector arrangements being arranged to transmit and/or receive data (column 7 lines 66-67 and column 8 lines 1-27), said at least one connector arrangement containing data at least about required bandwidth, identification and receiving/transmitting device data format (column 5 lines 57-67 and column 6 lines 1-5).

Consider claims 3 as applied to claim 1, 4 as applied to claim 3, and 5 as applied to claim 4. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system comprising a control logic, for handling one or several of: bandwidth allocation request, group connection set-up, group address setting, network status indication, connection status indication, and Terminal initiation (column 12 lines 45-62).

Consider claim 6, as applied to claim 4. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said control logic is provided in a least one connector arrangement being a receiving connector handling at least one of: group address setting, network status indication, and connection status indication (column 32 lines 55-67 and column 33 lines 1-54).

Consider claim 7, as applied to claim 5. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said terminal handles at least one of network status indication,

connection status indication, and terminal initiation at power-up or after disconnection of connector arrangements (column 32 lines 55-67 and column 33 lines 1-54).

Consider claim 10, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein the output from a connector arrangement connecting a transmitter device is adapted into a digital format, supported by a source port of a network transceiver in a terminal (column 2 lines 46-67 and column 3 lines 1-6).

Consider claim 11, as applied to claim 10. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein the adaptation is done in a transmitter adaptation, which is in one side connected to an output of the transmitter and in other side to a source port of the network transceiver in the terminal (column 19 lines 26-44).

Consider claim 12, as applied to claim 11. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein an adapted data, when inserted into the network, is captured in said Terminals in the network using an appropriate receiver connector arrangement where it is adapted back into an original format and delivered to a receiver device (column 10 lines 48-67 and column 11 lines 1-19).

Consider claim 13, as applied to claim 12. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein the adapted data stream from a transmitter device is captured in the terminal and adapted back in a receiver adaptation in the receiver connector arrangement and delivered to a receiver device (column 11 lines 20-63).

Consider claim 14, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein signals from several devices are transmitted simultaneously through the network (column 16 lines 63-67 and column 17 lines 1-19).

Consider claim 15, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein each connector arrangement comprises an identification set arrangement to configure receivers to corresponding transmitters (column 22 lines 50-67 and column 23 lines 1-12).

Consider claim 16, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein a connector arrangement comprises means to receive an analogue signal, means for converting said signal to a digital signal and means to transmit said digital signal on said network (column 11 lines 45-63).

Consider claim 17, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein a connector arrangement comprises means to receive a digital signal from said network, means for converting said signal to an analogue signal and means to couple said analogue signal to an analogue device (column 11 lines 45-63).

Consider claim 18, as applied to claim 16. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said analogue signal is one of audio or video signals, which can be compressed and/or encoded (column 20 lines 19-26).

Consider claim 19, as applied to claim 10. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said identification elements comprise switches for setting

unique identities for transmitting and receiving connector arrangements (column 9 lines 1-27).

Consider claim 20, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said connector arrangement comprises information member informing about accessibility and/or type of connection (column 2 lines 19-26).

Consider claim 23, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said network has one of a ring or star-topology (column 23 lines 13-19).

Consider claim 24, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said terminals are arranged in series and/or parallel (column 36 lines 4-7).

Consider claim 25, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said network is implemented as one of MOSTnet or IEEE 1394 (column 7 lines 66-67 and column 8 lines 1-27).

Consider claim 26, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said terminal and connector arrangement are integrated (column 7 lines 66-67 and column 8 lines 1-27).

Consider claim 27, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein at said terminals and connector arrangements are powered through same source (column 26 lines 26-37).

Consider claim 28, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein connector arrangements are arranged in said digital and/or analogous device (column 7 lines 31-54).

Consider claim 29, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein the system comprises wireless connection between connector arrangements and/or terminals (column 4 lines 27-47).

Consider claim 30, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein the network is accessed externally (column 11 lines 20-44).

Consider claim 31, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said identification element is controlled remotely (column 22 lines 26-49).

Consider claim 32, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a network system wherein said terminals and connector arrangements are connected wirelessly (column 4 lines 27-47).

Consider claim 34, as applied to claim 33. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a connector arrangement arranged in a digital and/or analogues device (column 11 lines 45-63).

Consider claim 36, as applied to claim 35. Gerszberg et al. further discloses a terminal comprising Control Ports and source ports configured in either serial or parallel mode (column 26 39-52 and column 36 lines 4-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 8-9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. (US 6480748 B1) in view of Laksono (US 7099951 B2).

Consider claim 2, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. discloses a facility management platform comprising network connector arrangements. However, Gerszberg et al. fails to disclose a network system wherein connector arrangements are connected to terminals through identical interfaces. Laksono discloses a method and apparatus for multimedia system comprising a network system wherein connector arrangements are connected to terminals through identical interfaces (column 35 lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a method and apparatus for multimedia system comprising a network system wherein connector arrangements are connected to terminals through identical interfaces as taught by Laksono with a facility management platform comprising network connector arrangements as taught by Gerszberg et al. for the purpose of servicing multiple sets of client modules from the same source grouping.

Consider claim 8, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al., as modified by Laksono, further discloses a network system wherein a group of connector arrangements consists of one transmitting and at least one receiving connector arrangements having same identity (Laksono, column 35 lines 5-15).

Consider claim 9, as applied to claim 8. Gerszberg et al., as modified by Laksono, further discloses a network system wherein said identity is user and/or at least partly pre-defined by means of an identification means (Gerszberg et al., column 22 lines 50-67 and column 23 lines 1-2).

Consider claim 21, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al., as modified by Laksono, further discloses a network system wherein said terminals and/or connector arrangements are identical (Laksono, column 35 lines 5-15).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. (US 6480748 B1) in view of Grenier et al. (US 7181511 B1).

Consider claim 22, as applied to claim 1. Gerszberg et al. discloses a facility management platform comprising network connector arrangements. However, Gerszberg et al. fails to disclose a network system wherein a connector arrangement identifies a network capacity and characteristic before transmitting on the network. Grenier et al. discloses a method for using software objects to manage devices connected to a network in a vehicle wherein a connector arrangement identifies a network capacity and characteristic before transmitting on the network (column 1 lines 65-67 and column 2 lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a method for using software objects to manage devices connected to a network in a vehicle wherein a connector arrangement identifies a network capacity and characteristic before transmitting on the network as taught by Grenier et al. with a facility management platform comprising network connector arrangements as taught by Gerszberg et al. for the purpose of discovery technologies.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Mark Fearer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1770. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Application/Control Number:
10/720,642
Art Unit: 2152

Page 13

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Mark Fearer
M.D.F./mdf
February 11, 2008

/Kenny S Lin/
Kenny S Lin
Primary Examiner